



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

tively free from corruption should be set in bolder relief. Ingenuity is always apparent, and in some cases the author has certainly been fortunate in finding that what interferes with his theory also offends scholars who are innocent of such a theory. But the total impression upon the reader is of uncertainty, of insecurity, that can be removed only by laborious effort. Even in details the argument is not always clear: Plautus is said not to use certain liberties in the cantica that are available in other meters; when we seek a reason for this, we find the implication that only under this condition will the theory hold. Such an account is valid when the theory is established, but at present we hardly know whether the theory supports the novelties in interpretation, or the novelties bolster up the theory.

It would be unfair, however, to charge all this confusion against the author; the subject is as perplexing a one as can be found, and the author's space was limited by the publisher. Sudhaus has rightly re-emphasized the importance of thought-units; he has indicated certain factors that must be reckoned with; he has not, however, prepared us for an immediate acceptance of his theory if it is to be applied to all the cantica. Finally, he should be encouraged to publish, in the manner of Schroeder's conspectuses of the lyrical measures of Greek drama, a complete conspectus of the Cantica Plautina in accord with his theory.

HENRY W. PRESCOTT

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

Daos: Tableau de la comédie grecque pendant la période dite nouvelle. Par PH.-E. LEGRAND. *Annales de l'Université de Lyon, Nouvelle Série II* ("Droit, Lettres"). Fascicule 22. Lyon et Paris, 1910. Pp. 673.

A *tableau*, not a historical study: but the author often traces the antecedents, sometimes suggests causes; still the book remains essentially a description; the text with all the Gallic sense of perspective and clearness of exposition, the notes as rich a sourcebook of material as could be made in Germany. The volume never carries us so far in its account of any phase of the subject as Leo's essay on the monologue; almost every paragraph anticipates a monograph instead of being based upon one. Special students of the period and of the literary type will welcome it as the first competent attempt to reveal the content, the form, and the spirit of the New Comedy, but should regard it as a stimulus to further and more searching historical study of every phase of the New Comedy. There could be no more admirable introduction to such historical study of details than this well-proportioned sketch of the whole field by one whose knowledge of Hellenistic poetry is enviable.

In his introduction M. Legrand defines the limits of time determined by his subject, and the extent and nature of the documentary evidence. The first part of the book deals with the content of the New Comedy. The characters, the incidents, the manners and customs, the psychology, the language are the elements chosen for treatment. The dominant impression made by this content is that the playwrights reproduced the life and thought of their environment without attempting idealization or fanciful adaptation. Here I may note the author's skill in describing the essential features of typical characters, his penetration in discerning variations of individuals within the type, the interesting array of literary evidence that proves the identity of incident in the drama and of incident in contemporary life, the attempt to explain abnormal features in the psychology as due to special exigencies of technique or of comic effect, and the suggestive sketch of the possible influence of contemporary philosophy upon the character-content. On the other hand, it may be observed that, although M. Legrand is careful to register the earlier appearances in comedy of the characters and incidents of the New Comedy, he does not help us materially to see the survival of elements from the Old Comedy; should not the study of character-types proceed, so far as possible, from the beginnings made in such a study as that of Süss on the characters of the Old Comedy? Nor does the author enrich and illuminate his discussion of the characters by much comparison of the valuable material in other literary types, especially the epigram, although his own essay on the courtesan in Lucian leads to the occasional introduction of matter from late prose. In general it is worth noting that this first section of the book contains perhaps the best picture of social life in Greece in the Hellenistic period that is available; the histories of the period seem to rejoice in neglecting the subject, possibly because the authors think the Latin comedies untrustworthy evidence. Happily, M. Legrand has got beyond this standpoint.

The second section is concerned with the form of the New Comedy. It is a first essay in technique, preceded only by Leo's study of the monologue, and Leo's treatment of the prologue and exposition and of the theory of five acts in his *Forschungen*. After a preliminary discussion of *contaminatio* and the distribution of rôles (as elements in the discrimination of Greek from Roman material), the author discusses the unity of action (the explanation of which he finds in the influence of tragedy and of the Aristotelian theory of unity; in this latter case some of us will prefer to await more positive evidence), the forces that direct the action (especially chance, and the persons in the drama), the stage conventions (monologue and aside, *entr'actes* and other devices for filling time, devices to meet limitations of space, interior scenes, the improbability of certain evolutions on and off the stage), the details of dramatic technique (the theory of five acts, prologue and exposition, the means of

rendering intelligible the action and the identity of the character). The monologue is regarded as the most conspicuous element in the technique of the New Comedy.

This second division of the book is the most valuable portion, not only because of its novelty in many respects but also because the author more often here than elsewhere suggests explanations, historical connections. In general he is to be commended for correlating the peculiarities of technique with the peculiar envioning conditions. His study of the distribution of rôles contains proof that Menander's plays required more than three actors. M. Legrand believes, however, that the poets did not favor the presence upon the scene of more than three speaking characters at one time, and explains apparent violations of the law in Latin comedies. Some interesting paragraphs on the treatment of the action I must pass over, noting again the author's skill in explaining certain improbabilities involved in the promotion or retardation of action by means of the eccentricities of individual characters. M. Legrand seems to me to have seriously invalidated Lundström's theory of the use of a *vestibulum* for interior scenes. At several points the author is open to adverse criticism. In the matter of omission: should we not have a chapter on the technique of character-treatment instead of being left to compose the subject from material scattered through the section? Why do we have a discussion of the means taken to assure the audience of the identity of the character on his appearance, but no account of the particularity in explaining the whence and whither of the movements of the characters, especially in connection with the convention of "right and left"? More important, however, is the neglect to make the elements of time and place fundamental in the discussion: to take, for example, the author's new attempt to establish the theory of five acts, and discover four pauses in the action of each comedy. He discovers such pauses on the basis of the amount of time required for action off the stage; but on pp. 426 ff. he has said that without interrupting the continuity of the scenes or suspending the action the New Comedy represents the action off the stage as advancing more rapidly than the action on the stage. That is, in the latter place he collects evidence to show that time is often disregarded. In the discovery of pauses in the action he assumes that time is regarded, and on this basis proceeds to establish a new application of an old theory. How may we be expected to believe that "a pause is desirable at *Adelphoe* 354 in order that Syrus may have time, between 286 and 361, to find Micio and tell him what is happening . . . , to receive money and pay Sannio . . . , to buy provisions and bring them home, etc.," until we know definitely what respect for time Terence or Menander shows in this and other plays? I fear that the liberties taken with time (426-28) are not exceptional but fundamental. (Cf., now, Polczyk *de unitatibus et loci et temporis in nova*

comoedia observatis, Breslau, 1909.) On the whole, however, M. Legrand has courageously undertaken and successfully initiated a study of the dramatic technique of the New Comedy.

In his third section the author proves without serious difficulty that the comedies are innocent of any moral purpose: they are meant to amuse, not instruct. They are not, or rather were not, demoralizing—"à sa façon, la comédie nouvelle a été prude." On this theme M. Legrand and Professor Mahaffy may be left to an amicable interview. Our author's discussion is sane. In his attempt to analyze the sources of comic effect M. Legrand is seldom more than suggestive; here a deeper study of ancient notions of the comic, a comparison of the ancient theory with Plautus and Terence, an intelligent study of the plays apart from ancient theory to determine the elements of comic effect, must precede any such description as the author gives us. He is only groping in the dark; he accumulates examples without increasing our appreciation of the humorous elements. Similarly in the chapters on pathetic effects he is skimming the surface.

The book is indispensable to the general student of literary history and of literary technique as the only essay of any magnitude in this important field of the New Comedy. To the special student of the period and of the literary type it makes a strong appeal because of the material collected in the notes, the stimulating suggestions in the text, and above all because it brings out clearly large relations in the right perspective; but it is in almost no respect definitive.

HENRY W. PRESCOTT

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

Poetae Latini Minores. Post Aemilium Baehrens iterum recensuit FRIDERICUS VOLLMER. Volumen I: "Appendix Vergiliana." Leipzig: Teubner, 1910. Pp. viii+208.

Jugendverse und Heimatpoesie Vergils: Erklärung des Catalepton. Von THEODOR BIRT. Leipzig und Berlin: B. G. Teubner, 1910. Pp. 198.

The revision of Baehrens' unsatisfactory work will be a great boon. Vollmer plans to omit the poems of Cicero and Germanicus, and the Anthology, but will add Dracontius and Merobaud. The initial volume follows the editor's theory of the text as set forth recently in the *Sitzungsberichte* of the Munich Academy. Any such theory in the case of the Vergilian appendix must be a subject of controversy, but the resultant text is as conservative as is consistent with intelligibility. The editor has used the new material available, apparently inspecting manuscripts or photographic facsimiles. His apparatus is much richer than